

User’s Perceptions of Impact of Physical Infrastructural Facilities on Quality of Teachers Produced in Faculties of Education in Universities, Southeast Nigeria

Udochukwu O. Marcel-Okafor

Department of Architectural Technology, Federal Polytechnic Nekede, Imo State

Abstract

The provision of infrastructural facilities to accommodate the activities in the education industry is germane to the effective implementation of programmes within the sector. The efforts to match the prevailing surge in demand for university education with requisite infrastructural facilities present a conspicuous challenge to stakeholders in the country. This is even more daunting following the uncertain aftermath of COVID-19 and the ensuing new normal characterised by remote working and general social distancing. In the face of the existing challenges, this study observes user’s perceptions of impact of available physical infrastructural facilities on the quality of teachers produced. It aims to establish a relationship between the provision of spaces and the quality of teachers that graduate from the institutions. The survey research design was adopted. The findings revealed that a preponderance (76%) of the respondents agree that the infrastructural facilities in their faculties contribute to the quality of teachers produced. The study concludes that there is an urgent need to boost the infrastructural facilities in the faculties and recommends a mutual collaboration between the government and private sector to surmount the existing challenges.

Keywords: *Infrastructural Facilities, University Education, Teachers, Quality*

Date of Submission: 29-03-2022

Date of Acceptance: 10-04-2022

I. Introduction

There is no gainsaying the role education plays in national development worldwide. Education represents the major tool for sustainable human development. National development is a fundamental component every undeveloped country across the globe aspires to acquire, while the developed countries take pride in the realization of advanced level of development as a key function of self-sufficiency and sustainability. Beneath all efforts to develop, and advance in any worthwhile goal lies the power of education and data. The different rewards allied with generating educated people were expounded in the 2018 World Development Report (WDR) by the World Bank, captioned “Learning to Realize Education’s Promise”. The 2018 WDR explored four themes, and the third theme focused on how to make schools work for learners (The World Bank, 2018). Again, in 2021 the impact of data as a tool to harness potentials in the face of challenges ensuing COVID-19 aftermath was the focus of the 2021 WDR entitled “Data for Better Lives” (The World Bank, 2022). These two reports have emphasised the importance of education and information as key tools to development.

Nigeria, like other developing nations, has set national policies on education which are linked to the National Development Plan. These goals stated in the National Policy on Education (NPE) form the core of the Nigerian educational objectives, which states among others that ‘education and training facilities shall continue to be expanded in response to social needs and made progressively accessible to all individuals to be afforded a more diversified and flexible choice’ (Victor, 2019). However, the advent and continuous prominence of technology has influenced the educational system in Nigeria, with positive national policy reforms, resulting in a visible electronic system of education in Nigeria. The electronic system of education consists of e-Books, e-Classrooms, e-Libraries and e-Exams. The three (3) tiers of the educational system in the country comprise primary, secondary and tertiary levels (National Policy on Education, 2020). The university education, which is at the top in the tertiary level, forms the focal point of this study.

The university education in its over seven decades existence in Nigeria has transformed from a profound dependence on the highly debated western module of education to one reflecting more on the local aspirations of the Nigerian people. Madu and Adebisi (2021) stated that universities as citadels of learning for the development of skilled manpower are laden with the conceptualisation, interchange and propagation of knowledge for human and societal development. The university education is therefore the apparatus of development necessary to shape novel world activities. Although, the number of universities in the country has steadily increased from 51 in 2005 to the existing 128, the demand for university education is still a daunting

challenge, which Ademola, Ogundipe, & Babatunde (2014) credited to the rapidly growing youth population of the country, and succinctly observed that 98% of students that constitute the survey list conducted, affirm the presence of modern adequate infrastructure as a critical deciding factor when choosing the university. The situation is more challenging as nations globally are contending with the aftermath of COVID-19 pandemic and the resultant new normal realities characterised by remote working, learning and general social distancing. Nigeria, the most populated nation in sub-Saharan Africa with a population of over 200 million people, is not left out in the chaos. Resuming new normal activities in the country provides an opportunity for stakeholders to access Covid-19 response and prevention roadmap. This reiterates the importance of education which facilitates information dissemination, understanding and implementation of protection and prevention guidelines.

1.1 Statement of Problem

Since the commencement of university education in 1948, Nigeria has experienced tremendous changes, characterised by an explosive population growth, rapid urbanisation, and attendant socio-economic changes. The enrolment of students into the tertiary level has risen in the past forty (40) years from 15,000 in the early 1970s to approximately 1.2 million in the early 2000s. Statistics showed that in the 2018/2019 school year, Nigerian universities recorded 1.8 million undergraduate students and two hundred and forty-two thousand (242,000) postgraduate students. The country's largest university, the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN), also recorded over half of a million students in the same year (Sasu, 2022). However, a plethora of studies have revealed that this surge in the number of applicants has not been met with the necessary infrastructure in the tertiary institutions and universities in particular (Okebukola, 2008; Ademola, Ogundipe, & Babatunde, 2014; Akomolafe & Adesua, 2016; Amadi & Ohaka, 2018; Madu & Adebisi, 2021).

Although, the availability of school buildings and other facilities boosts decent school enrolment as they enhance effective pedagogic activities (Onasanya & Adegbija, 2007; Barrett, Treves, Shmis, Ambasz, & Ustinova, 2019). Yet, inadequate and obsolete infrastructure and equipment such as poor library facilities, inadequate classrooms, and laboratories as well as the general dilapidated environment of most universities which do not promote optimal learning, teaching and research constitute the bane of students' enrolment in Nigerian universities (Okebukola, 2008; Mac-Barango & Kakulu, 2014; Nwogu & Esobhawan, 2014; Babatola & Babatola, 2020). A clear instance is in the 2011/2012 admission year, the University of Lagos with a carrying capacity of 6000 received applications from over 99,000 candidates which meant that 90% of the potential candidates were declined due to non-availability of infrastructural facilities to accommodate prospective students (Ademola, Ogundipe, & Babatunde, 2014). Furthermore, Mac-Barango and Kakulu (2014) opined that the poorly maintained facilities and structures in the universities constitute a social menace. However, Madu and Adebisi (2021) observed that in an effort to justify access to university education for prospective students, many universities have over-enrolled their carrying capacities in lieu of providing more facilities. A situation that inadvertently impacts on the quality of education provided.

1.2 Aim and Objectives

The aim of this study is to identify gaps in provision of state-of-the-art infrastructural facilities in faculties of education in southeast Nigerian universities in order to provide government and other relevant stakeholders with recommendations on how the gaps could be addressed, with a view to developing guidelines for improvement of physical infrastructural facilities used in training the trainers. In order to realise this aim the following objectives were pursued and they were meant to:

1. Examine the infrastructural facilities in the faculties of education in universities in Southeast Nigeria and the quantity of teachers produced within the study area.
2. Assess the state of available infrastructural facilities in the institutions and the quality of teachers produced within the study area.
3. Assess the available infrastructural facilities and the levels of staffing in the institutions within the study area.
4. Examine the perceptions of teachers and students on infrastructural facilities used in the training processes and infrastructural facilities used in practice.

1.3 Research Questions

During the course of the research, answers were sought to the following research questions;

RQ1: To what extent have the infrastructural facilities in the faculties of education affected the quantity of teachers produced within the study area?

RQ2: To what extent have the infrastructural facilities available in the institutions influenced the quality of teachers produced within the study area?

RQ3: What is the relationship between the available infrastructural facilities and the levels of staffing in the institutions within the study area?

RQ4: Are there any differences in the perceptions of teachers and students on infrastructural facilities used in the training processes and infrastructural facilities used in practice?

1.4 Hypotheses

At the outset of the study the following tentative answers are given to the aforementioned research questions posed;

H₀₁ There is no significant relationship between the state of infrastructural facilities available in the institutions and the quality of teachers produced within the study area.

H₀₂ There is no significant relationship between the quality of infrastructural facilities in the department and usage by staff and students.

II. Literature Review

Nwogu and Esobhawan (2014) aptly posited that teachers are channels for the intellectual, socio-economic, scientific and technological developments of every society. This places the teacher at the pivotal role in national development. The implication is that training the teacher for quality service delivery are vital components of education system of the nation. The drive to assess how students and teachers perceive the infrastructural facilities in their faculties of education is informed by the need to provide a framework for the improvement of teacher-friendly environment, which will enhance the teaching processes and development of quality teachers both at regional and national level.

The physical infrastructural facilities are referred to the basic physical structures that make up the constructed environment which enable the faculties to function properly. Akomolafe and Adesua, (2016) identified these facilities to include classrooms, library, laboratories, offices, toilets and other facilities that would enhance student motivation to learning. The facilities enhance effective teaching and learning activities, and contribute in no small measure to the provision of quality education available. A plethora of studies have confirmed that the quality and quantity of educational facilities available within an educational system have intricate nexus with the standard and quality of the entire educational system (Chine, 2005; Baltas, 2005; Nwofor, Nwana, Ilorah, & Obidiegwu, 2005; Fabiyi & Uzoka, 2009; Abdullahi & Wan Yusoff, 2015; Amadi & Ohaka, 2018; Barrett, Treves, Shmis, Ambasz, & Ustinova, 2019; Santika, Pangestu, & Nurahlaini, 2021). The study adopts the specifications of the National Universities Commission (NUC) as a benchmark for the evaluation, and it states that there shall be adequate physical facilities, classrooms, laboratories, studios, workshops, and equipment as well as provisions for periodic update of the facilities and equipment so as to provide ample learning experiences necessary to attain the aims and objectives of the faculties of education (National Universities Commission NUC, 2019).

Twelve (12) out of the twenty-four (24) universities spread across the five states of the zone offer NUC accredited education programmes. The universities are listed below (see Table 1). The faculty of education is a group of related departments within a university, that offer education based programmes and at the end of which, the Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degrees are awarded successful students. The faculty mainly prepares professional teachers, school administrative personnel and researchers in the different departments that constitute the faculty both in undergraduate and postgraduate levels. The faculties comprise an average of five departments which vary among the universities in Southeast Nigeria. The departments can be classified into the following;

1. Arts and Social Education
2. Education Foundations
3. Science Education
4. Vocational and Technical Education
5. Adult and continuing Education
6. Early Childhood and Primary Education
7. Library and information Science
8. Human Kinetics and Health Education
9. Guidance and Counselling
10. Education Management and Policy (NOUN, 2019; Nnamdi Azikiwe University, 2022).

Table 1: List of NUC accredited Universities in Southeast Nigeria
(* Universities that offer NUC accredited education programmes)

S/N	Name of Institution	Date of Establishment	Ownership
1.	University of Nigeria, Nsukka Campus/ Alvan Campus	1960	Federal*
2.	Federal University of Technology, Owerri	1980	Federal
3.	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State	1992	Federal*
4.	Alex Ekwueme, Ndufe Alike, Ikwo Ebonyi State	2011	Federal*
5.	Micheal Okpara University of Agriculture	2013	Federal*
6.	Abia State University, Uturu, Abia State	1981	State*
7.	Enugu State University of Science and Tech.	1982	State*
8.	Imo State University, Owerri, Imo State	1992	State*
9.	Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State	1996	State*
10.	Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Uli, Anambra State	2000	State*
11.	Kingsley Ozumba Mbadiwe University, Ogboko, Imo State	2016	State
12.	Madonna University, Okija, Anambra State	1999	Private*
13.	Caritas University, Enugu, Enugu State	2005	Private
14.	Renaissance University, Enugu State	2005	Private
15.	Tansian University, Umunya, Anambra State	2007	Private*
16.	Godfrey Okoye University, Ugwuomu-Nike, Enugu State	2009	Private*
17.	Paul University, Awka, Anambra State	2009	Private
18.	Gregory University, Uturu, Abia State	2012	Private
19.	Evangel University, Akaeze, Ebonyi State	2012	Private
20.	Clifford University, Owerinta Abia State	2016	Private
21.	Coal City University, Enugu State	2016	Private
22.	Spiritana University, Nneochi, Abia State	2017	Private
23.	Maranathan University, Mgbidi, Imo State	2021	private
24.	Claretian University of Nigeria, Nekede, Imo State	2021	Private

Source: (National Universities Commission, 2021)

III. Methodology

This study adopted the mixed methods research design, wherein data is collected in two phases. The use of qualitative data to explore research problem and subsequent use of quantitative data to develop the outcomes (Creswell, 2006). Specifically oral interviews were used to elicit responses from teachers and students about perceptions of the available and usable infrastructural facilities. The survey research design method, which comprised administration of structured questionnaire, was used to obtain quantitative data from the teachers and students that constitute the respondents.

The twelve (12) universities spread across the five states of the zone with NUC accredited faculties of education form the research population. Based on ownership structure, four (4) out of five (5) universities owned by the Federal Government within the zone offer education programmes. Five (5) out of six (6) State owned universities within the zone offer education programmes. Three (3) out of ten (10) private owned universities within the zone offer education programmes. Due to this heterogeneous structure, the stratified method of sampling was adopted in deriving the samples.

Three (3) homogenous groups comprising the Federal owned institutions, the State owned institutions and privately owned institutions are derived. Proportional allocations in the ratio 2:1:1 for the Federal, State and Private owned schools were adopted in choosing the number of schools to study. A random sampling through balloting was used to select samples from each stratum of homogenous populations. Table 2 shows the institutions randomly selected through balloting for the study.

Table 2: List of randomly selected NUC accredited Universities in Southeast Nigeria with faculties of education

S/N	Name of Institution	Date of Establishment	Ownership
1.	University of Nigeria, Alvan Ikoku Campus	1984	Federal
2.	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State	1991	Federal
3.	Imo State University, Owerri, Imo State	1992	State
4.	Madonna University, Okija, Anambra State	1999	Private

To determine the size of the sample (*n*) for this research population, the study adopted a sample size based on desired accuracy with a population percentage or variability of 50%, confidence level of 95%, and a 5% margin of error (Gill, Johnson, & Clark, 2010) cited in (Taherdoost, 2017). Gill et al. (2010) presented sample size appropriate for specified permutations of precision, confidence levels and a population percentage or variability of 50% . Taherdoost (2016) posited that the crucial point in generating a sample size lies not in the

proportion of the research population that gets sampled but rather in the entire size of the sample chosen in relation to the obscurity of the population, the aim of the researcher and the kinds of statistical procedure that constitute the data analysis. Taherdoost (2017) further asserted that the sample size reflects the number of positive responses, and not essentially the quantity of questionnaire distributed; which is often augmented to make allowance for copies not returned. Hence, due to the varying size of the population, a sample size of 200 was chosen. Fifty (50) copies of the questionnaire were administered in each of the four schools by the research assistants to respondents according to first contact basis. Ten (10) copies were in each of the schools reserved for the teaching staff and the remaining forty (40) copies were administered to students.

Oral interviews, physical observations, and structured questionnaires with pre-determined questions were used as research instruments for the study. In order to ensure validity, the study adopted the content-related evidence and consequently chose the survey method in view of the key characteristics of the study, which is based on the availability and usability of physical infrastructural facilities. The random sampling process was adopted in the selection of the sample size, and experienced lecturers of the faculty of education were consulted, who assisted to ascertain the validity of the research instruments. The internal consistency method which is the consistency of responses by the respondents was used for the reliability test.

The direct method of administering the structured type of questionnaire with pre-determined questions meant to elicit responses from the respondents in relation to variables identified in objective 1, 2, 3 and 4 was used. The data collected was analysed at three levels. The first level is the univariate level, involving frequency distribution using descriptive and statistical techniques. The second level is the bivariate analysis, wherein the correlations amongst the variables were established. The third and final level is the multivariate, wherein regression analysis was used.

IV. Data analysis, interpretation and discussion of findings

Data collected from the survey were presented for analyses and subsequent interpretation of results. It is important to emphasise that these data were derived based on the research questions which target the topic, aim and objectives of the study. This section therefore, presents analysis of data collected using statistical tools indicated in the research methodology.

4.1 Demographic data of the institutions

Table 3 showed that out of 200 questionnaires administered to the respondents from the four (4) schools that constitute the sample size, some questionnaires were not returned. This explains the variation in the frequencies.

Table 3: The name of institution

Institution	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
UNIZIK	49	25.3	25.3	25.3
IMSU	48	24.7	24.7	50.0
Madonna	49	25.3	25.3	75.3
NSUKKA-ALVAN	48	24.7	24.7	100.0
Total	194	100.0	100.0	

4.2 Relationship between the quality of infrastructural facilities available in the institutions and the quality of teachers produced within the study area.

The cross tabulation of Table 4 shows that the highest number (32) of the respondents who strongly agree that infrastructural facilities in their department contribute to the quality of teachers produced also rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Good'. The highest number (32) of those who agree that infrastructural facilities in their department contribute to the quality of teachers produced rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Fair'. The same trend also follows that the highest number (16) of those who neither agreed nor disagreed that infrastructural facilities in their department contribute to the quality of teachers produced, rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Poor', while the highest number (7) of those who disagreed that that infrastructural facilities in their department contribute to the quality of teachers produced, rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Good'. The Chi-Square test below will reveal these descriptive as significant or not.

Table 4: Cross tabulation of Quality of Infrastructural facilities and quality of teachers produced

			On a scale of 1 – 5, rate the quality of infrastructural facilities in your department.				Total
			Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	
Infrastructural facilities in your department contribute to the quality of teachers produced?	Strongly agree	Count	20	22	32	0	74
		Expected Count	17.8	22.5	31.8	1.9	74.0
	Agree	Count	5	32	29	5	71
		Expected Count	17.1	21.6	30.5	1.9	71.0
	Neither agree nor disagree	Count	16	4	14	0	34
		Expected Count	8.2	10.3	14.6	.9	34.0
	Disagree	Count	5	0	7	0	12
		Expected Count	2.9	3.6	5.2	.3	12.0
	Total	Count	46	58	82	5	191
		Expected Count	46.0	58.0	82.0	5.0	191.0

H₀1: There is no significant relationship between the infrastructural facilities available in the institutions and the quality of teachers produced within the study area.

Decision Rule: We shall reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than the alpha (α), otherwise, we will not. $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 5: Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	P-Value
Pearson Chi-Square	39.615	9	0.00
N of Valid Cases	191		

Inference

Since the p-value (0.00) in Table 5 is less than the alpha (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis and assert that there is relationship between the quality of infrastructural facilities available in the institutions and the quality of teachers produced.

4.3 Adequacy of infrastructural facilities in the institution for the number of students enrolled

Table 6 showed that a preponderance of the respondents (87.6%) said that the facilities were not adequate. The remaining less than one-third of the respondents (12%) observed the facilities as adequate for the number of students.

Table 6: Adequacy of the infrastructural facilities in the department for number of students enrolled

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	24	12.4	12.4	12.4
No	170	87.6	87.6	100.0
Total	194	100.0	100.0	

4.4 The quality of infrastructural facilities in the department associated with usage by the lecturers

The contingency table (cross tabulation) below in Table 7 showed that the highest number (53) of the respondents who said they do not often use the infrastructural facilities in their department for teaching and learning also rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Fair'. The highest number (20) of those who rarely often use the infrastructural facilities in their department for teaching and learning also rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Good'. The highest number (36) of those who often use the infrastructural facilities in their department for teaching and learning also rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Good', while the highest number (6) of those who, very often, use the infrastructural facilities in their department for teaching and learning rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as 'Poor'. Since those who use the facilities very often rated the quality of the facilities as poor, this implies that the facilities are not of good quality because they are the ones who can ascertain the quality of the facilities. Further analysis (Chi-Square test) in Table 8 revealed the nature of the aforementioned assumptions.

Table 7: Cross tabulation of usage of the infrastructural facilities and the quality of infrastructural facilities in the department.

			On a scale of 1 – 5, rate the quality of infrastructural facilities in your department.				Total	
			Poor	Fair	Good	Very good		
How often do you use the infrastructural facilities in your department for teaching and learning?	Not often	Count	17	53	21	5	96	
		Expected Count	22.8	30.2	40.6	2.5	96.0	
	Rare often	Count	18	5	20	0	43	
		Expected Count	10.2	13.5	18.2	1.1	43.0	
	often	Count	5	0	36	0	41	
		Expected Count	9.7	12.9	17.3	1.1	41.0	
	Very often	Count	6	3	5	0	14	
		Expected Count	3.3	4.4	5.9	.4	14.0	
	Total		Count	46	61	82	5	194
			Expected Count	46.0	61.0	82.0	5.0	194.0

H₀2 There is no significant relationship between the quality of infrastructural facilities in the department and usage by staff and students.

Decision Rule: We shall reject the null hypothesis if the p-value is less than the alpha (α), otherwise, we will not. $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 8: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	P-Value
Pearson Chi-Square	82.830 ^a	9	0.000
N of Valid Cases	194		

Inference

Since the p-value (0.00) from the results displayed in Table 8 is less than the alpha (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the quality of infrastructural facilities in the department is associated with usage by the lecturers. This implies that the many lecturers who rarely use the facilities, but went ahead to rate the quality of the facilities as ‘Good’, could not ascertain the quality of the facilities, rather the few who use the facilities who rated the quality of the facilities as ‘Poor’ really know the state of the facilities.

Table 9 shows that out of 194 respondents surveyed, 5 (2.6%) rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as Very Good, while 46 (23.7%) rated it as Poor. Also 82 (42.3%) respondents rated it as Good, while 61 (31.4%) rated it as Fair. This shows that over half of the respondents, 55.1% (23.7 + 31.4), rated the quality of infrastructural facilities in their department as not good, compared to 44.9% (42.3+2.6) who rated it as good.

Table 9: Quality of infrastructural facilities in the department

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Poor	46	23.7	23.7	23.7
Fair	61	31.4	31.4	55.2
Good	82	42.3	42.3	97.4
Very good	5	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total	194	100.0	100.0	

Table 10 shows that out 186 respondents who responded to this question, 109 (58.6%) said that the infrastructural facilities in their department undergo regular maintenance, while 77 (41.4%) said that the facilities do not undergo regular maintenance.

Table 10: Rate of maintenance of the infrastructural facilities in the department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	109	56.2	58.6	58.6
	No	77	39.7	41.4	100.0
	Total	186	95.9	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.1		
Total		194	100.0		

Table 11 shows that a majority of respondents (94.7%) surveyed, affirmed that their departments urgently require some infrastructural facilities, while 10 (5.3%) of the respondents did not agree.

Table 11: Urgent need of infrastructural facilities in the department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	179	92.3	94.7	94.7
	No	10	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	189	97.4	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.6		
Total		194	100.0		

Table 12 shows that a preponderance of the respondents (186 (95.9%)) surveyed said that the available infrastructural facilities in their department are not sufficient, while 8 (4.1%) of the respondents said that they are sufficient.

Table 12: Available infrastructural facilities sufficient for the members of staff in the department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	8	4.1	4.1	4.1
	No	186	95.9	95.9	100.0
	Total	194	100.0	100.0	

Table 13 shows that over half of respondents (52.9%) were of the view that the infrastructural facilities used in their department are current with modern technology, while 90 (47.1%) had a divergent view.

Table 13: Technological currency of infrastructural facilities used in the department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	101	52.1	52.9	52.9
	No	90	46.4	47.1	100.0
	Total	191	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.5		
Total		194	100.0		

Table 14 shows that over half (55.4%) of the total number of respondents who were surveyed said that the teaching aides are similar to the equipment used in practice, while 82 (44.6%) said they are not similar.

Table 14: Similarity of teaching aides and the equipment used in practice

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Yes	102	52.6	55.4	55.4
	No	82	42.3	44.6	100.0
	Total	184	94.8	100.0	
Missing	System	10	5.2		
Total		194	100.0		

Table 15 shows that over two-thirds (38.7 + 37.2 = 75.9%) of the respondents who responded to this question, strongly agree and agree that infrastructural facilities in their department contribute to the quality of teachers produced, while 12 (6.3%) respondents disagree, and 34 (17.8%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 15: Infrastructural facilities in your department contribute to the quality of teachers produced?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly agree	74	38.1	38.7	38.7
	Agree	71	36.6	37.2	75.9
	Neither agree nor disagree	34	17.5	17.8	93.7
	Disagree	12	6.2	6.3	100.0

	Total	191	98.5	100.0
Missing	System	3	1.5	
Total		194	100.0	

Table 16 shows that 111 (57.2%) of the total number of respondents who were surveyed strongly agree that infrastructural facilities in their department need to be technologically upgraded, 56 (28.9%) also agreed, while 5 (2.6%) disagreed and 22 (11.3%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 16: Need to upgrade Infrastructural facilities in the department

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	111	57.2	57.2	57.2
Agree	56	28.9	28.9	86.1
Neither agree nor disagree	22	11.3	11.3	97.4
Disagree	5	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total	194	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 shows that out of the total number (194) of respondents surveyed, 96 (49.5%) said that they rarely use the infrastructural facilities in their department for teaching and learning, 43 (22.2%) said they sometimes use them, 41 (21.1%) said they often use them, while 14 (7.2%) said they always use them.

Table 17: Frequency of use of facilities in their department

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rarely	96	49.5	49.5	49.5
Sometimes	43	22.2	22.2	71.6
Often	41	21.1	21.1	92.8
Always	14	7.2	7.2	100.0
Total	194	100.0	100.0	

4.5 Discussions

The summation of relevant findings and issues as they relate to availability and usability of infrastructural facilities in faculties of education were discussed. The variables of interest were concerned with availability of the infrastructural facilities and the usage of the facilities in teaching and learning. Over 80% of the respondents revealed that infrastructural facilities in their respective departments are not adequate for the number of students enrolled, which supports (Babatola & Babatola, 2020). 95% of the respondents affirmed that their departments are in urgent need of infrastructural facilities (Ademola, Ogundipe, & Babatunde, 2014). However, 53% confirmed that the infrastructural facilities used in their departments are furnished with current digital equipment and teaching facilities which are in tandem with facilities and equipment used in practice. 76% of the respondents agree that the infrastructural facilities in their department contribute to the quality of teachers produced. This supports previous studies (Akomolafe & Adesua, 2016; Amadi & Ohaka, 2018). Hence, the findings reveal that the infrastructural facilities in the faculties significantly impact on the quality of products from the institutions.

In furtherance, the usability of these facilities reveals significant relationships with the availability and quality of the facilities. This explains the reason why the respondents who rarely use the facilities rated them in good conditions while those in constant use of these facilities were of the views that they needed both maintenance and upgrading.

4.6 Implication to research and recommendations

The study revealed that the existing infrastructural facilities have technologically current teaching facilities. However, the limited number of such facilities and the constant usage results in aggravated breakdown. It is against this backdrop that the following recommendations are proposed;

1. Provision of more physical infrastructural facilities to match the surge in student enrolment and the subsequent furnishing of the facilities with state of the art digital equipment will go a long way to enhance the quality of graduates from the faculties of education.
2. Regular maintenance of the existing facilities to eschew unnecessary breakdown and consistent upgrading of equipment in order to maintain viable graduates that can compete in both local and international market environment.

V. Conclusion

This study has analytically explored the availability and usability of physical infrastructural facilities in faculties of education. Specifically, the various infrastructural facilities used in faculties of education where teachers are trained, as well as the usability of the facilities were examined. The findings revealed that over two-thirds (76%) of the respondents agree that the infrastructural facilities in their faculties contribute to the quality of teachers produced. The study concludes that there is an urgent need to boost the infrastructural facilities in the faculties so as to improve the overall development of teachers.

References

- [1]. Abdullahi, I., & Wan Yusoff, W. Z. (2015). State of physical facilities of higher education institutions in Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 1-5.
- [2]. Ademola, E. O., Ogundipe, A. T., & Babatunde, W. T. (2014). Students' enrollment into tertiary institutions in Nigeria: The influence of the founder's reputation- A case study. *Computing, Information Systems, Development Informatics & Allied Research Journal*, 5(3), 55-64.
- [3]. Akomolafe, C. O., & Adesua, V. O. (2016). The impact of physical facilities on students' level of motivation and academic performance in senior secondary schools in south west Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(4), 38-42.
- [4]. Amadi, N. S., & Ohaka, A. O. (2018). Influence of Poor Infrastructure on Vocational Teacher Education in Rivers State Universities. *International Journal of Innovative Social & Science Education Research*, 54-62.
- [5]. Babatola, J. E., & Babatola, M. J. (2020, Feb). *Overview of Tertiary Education in Nigeria (1947-2020): Structural Analysis and Policy Framework*. Retrieved Feb 2022, from Academia: <https://doi.org/10.14516/ete.230>
- [6]. Baltas, E. (2005). "Evaluation of School Building Indices Quality System" in Greece: A tool for decision makers. 101-114.
- [7]. Barrett, P., Treves, A., Shmis, T., Ambasz, D., & Ustinova, M. (2019). *The impact of School Infrastructure on Learning*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- [8]. Chine, B. C. (2005). Environment and its impact on quality education: The case for tertiary educational institution in Nigeria. *The international journal of Forum for African women educationalists nigerian*, 1(3).
- [9]. Creswell, J. W. (2006). *Choosing a mixed methods Design*. Retrieved 2021, from Sage Publications: <https://www.sagepub.com>
- [10]. Fabiyi, A., & Uzoka, N. (2009). State of physical facilities in Nigerian universities: Implications for repositioning tertiary institutions for global competition. *Proceedings of Towards Quality in African Higher Education, Higher Education Research and Policy Network (HERPNET)*, 180-187.
- [11]. Gill, J., Johnson, P., & Clark, M. (2010). *Research Methods for Managers* (4 ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- [12]. Mac-Barango, D., & Kakulu, I. I. (2014). *Enhancing Infrastructural Facilities for Sustainable Development in Nigerian Universities - Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), A Veritable Tool*. Retrieved 2022, from ResearchGate: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266912916>
- [13]. Madu, O. M., & Adebisi, O. (2021). School Enrolment Growth and Carrying Capacity of Universities in Imo State, Nigeria. *International journal of Recent Innovations in Academic Research*, 5(6), 23-32.
- [14]. National Policy on Education. (2020). *National Policy on Education pdf*. Retrieved 2022, from <https://education.gov.ng>
- [15]. National Universities Commission. (2021). *List of NUC approved universities and courses*. Retrieved 2022, from National Universities Commission: <https://www.nuc.edu.ng/nigerian-universities>
- [16]. Nnamdi Azikiwe University. (2022). *Faculty of Education*. Retrieved 2022, from Nnamdi Azikiwe University: info@unizik.edu.ng
- [17]. NOUN. (2019). *Faculty of Education*. Retrieved 2022, from National Open University of Nigeria: [nou.edu.ng>faculties>faculty-education](http://nou.edu.ng/faculties/faculty-education)
- [18]. Nwofor, F. A., Nwana, R. E., Ilorah, H. C., & Obidiegwu, U. J. (2005). The Library as a veritable instrument for reaching the aims and objectives of migrant education. *International Journal of Forum for African Women Educationalists Nigeria (FAWEN)*, 1(3), 24-32.
- [19]. Nwogu, U. J., & Esobhawan, B. I. (2014). Teacher quality and quantity: Implementation of Universal Basic Education in Nigeria. *Academic Research International*, 5(1), 199-208.
- [20]. Okebukola, P. C. (2008). Education reform: Imperatives for achieving vision20-2020. *Paper presented at the National Summit on Education Organised by Senate Committee on Education*. Abuja.
- [21]. Santika, F., Pangestu, U., & Nurahlaini, M. (2021). School Facilities and Infrastructure Management in Improving Education Quality. *International journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 280-285.
- [22]. Sasu, D. D. (2022, February 1). *Number of universities in Nigeria 2021 by ownership*. Retrieved February 8, 2022, from Statista: <https://www.statista.com>
- [23]. Sasu, D. D. (2022). *Number of university students in Nigeria in the 2018/2019 academic session*. Retrieved from Statista: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/113079/number-of-university-students-in-nigeria>
- [24]. Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *International Journal of Advance Research in Management*, 5(2), 18-27.
- [25]. Taherdoost, H. (2017). Determining Sample Size. *International Journal of Economics and Management Systems*, 2, 237-239.
- [26]. The World Bank. (2018). *World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise*. Retrieved 2021, from The World Bank: www.worldbank.org
- [27]. The World Bank. (2022). *WDR Reports*. Retrieved 2022, from The World Bank: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr/wdr-archive>
- [28]. Victor, C. (2019, November 29). *National Policy on Education in Nigeria; Aims, Objectives, Challenges*. Retrieved 2022, from InfoGuide Nigeria: <https://infoguidenigeria.com>

Udochukwu O. Marcel-Okafor. " User's Perceptions of Impact of Physical Infrastructural Facilities on Quality of Teachers Produced in Faculties of Education in Universities, Southeast Nigeria." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 12(02), (2022): pp. 28-37.